

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVE W. COMSTOCK,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,  
Commissioner of Social Security,  
Defendant.

NO. CV 08-3204 AGR

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND  
ORDER

Steve Comstock filed this action on May 15, 2008. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), the parties consented to proceed before Magistrate Judge Rosenberg on May 22 and August 4, 2008. (Dkt. Nos. 6, 7.) On January 14, 2009, the parties filed a Joint Stipulation (“JS”) that addressed the disputed issues. The Court has taken the matter under submission without oral argument.

Having reviewed the entire file, the matter is remanded for an award of benefits.

///

///

///

///

1

## PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On May 23, 2005, Comstock filed an application for disability insurance benefits. A.R. 63-67. The applications were denied initially and upon reconsideration. A.R. 48-49. An Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) conducted a hearing on January 19, 2007, at which Comstock testified. A.R. 319-340. On November 5, 2007, the ALJ issued a decision denying benefits. A.R. 19-29. Comstock requested review. A.R. 16.

On April 22, 2008, the Appeals Council (“AC”) issued a decision in which it (1) granted Comstock’s request to change the alleged disability onset date from October 27, 2003, to November 2, 2004; (2) adopted the ALJ’s “statements regarding the pertinent provisions of the social Security Act, Social Security Administration Regulations, Social Security Rulings and Acquiescence Rulings, the issues in the case, and the evidentiary facts, as applicable”; (3) did not adopt the ALJ’s “findings or conclusions regarding whether the claimant is disabled”; (4) found Comstock not to be disabled; and (5) designated its decision as the final decision of the Commissioner. A.R. 6-13.

This lawsuit followed.

11

## **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), this Court reviews the Commissioner's decision to deny benefits. The decision will be disturbed only if it is not supported by substantial evidence, or if it is based upon the application of improper legal standards. *Moncada v. Chater*, 60 F.3d 521, 523 (9th Cir. 1995); *Drouin v. Sullivan*, 966 F.2d 1255, 1257 (9th Cir. 1992).

“Substantial evidence” means “more than a mere scintilla but less than a preponderance – it is such relevant evidence that a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support the conclusion.” *Moncada*, 60 F.3d at 523. In

1 determining whether substantial evidence exists to support the Commissioner's  
2 decision, the Court examines the administrative record as a whole, considering  
3 adverse as well as supporting evidence. *Drouin*, 966 F.2d at 1257. When the  
4 evidence is susceptible to more than one rational interpretation, the Court must  
5 defer to the Commissioner's decision. *Moncada*, 60 F.3d at 523.

6 **III.**

7 **DISCUSSION**

8 **A. Disability**

9 A person qualifies as disabled, and thereby eligible for such benefits, "only  
10 if his physical or mental impairment or impairments are of such severity that he is  
11 not only unable to do his previous work but cannot, considering his age,  
12 education, and work experience, engage in any other kind of substantial gainful  
13 work which exists in the national economy." *Barnhart v. Thomas*, 540 U.S. 20,  
14 21-22, 124 S. Ct. 376, 157 L. Ed. 2d 333 (2003).

15 **B. Background**

16 Comstock worked as a motion picture studio grip from 1976 to 2003. A.R.  
17 73. On September 16, 2002, "he and a coworker were loading a truck with  
18 stucco set walls weighing over 500 pounds . . . when 1 of the walls fell over  
19 striking [Comstock] on his head." A.R. 137. Comstock was "unconscious for a  
20 few seconds. When he came to, he noted a dull aching pain in his head with a  
21 lump, neck, bilateral shoulders/arms, low back with pain radiating to his bilateral  
22 legs." *Id.* He was treated for his injuries over the next few years and declared  
23 permanent and stationary by his treating physician, Dr. deGrange, effective  
24 February 1, 2005. A.R. 195. Sometime after his injuries, he returned to work for  
25 light duty but stopped in October 2003 because of symptoms. A.R. 324-325.

26 **C. Appeals Council Findings**

27 The AC found that Comstock has the following severe impairment:  
28 "cervical and lumbar disc disease." A.R. 12. Comstock has the residual

1 functional capacity (“RFC”) to “lift 20 lbs occasionally, 10 lbs frequently, stand,  
2 walk for six out of eight hours; frequently climb, balance, stoop, kneel, crouch,  
3 and crawl.” *Id.* The AC found that Comstock could not perform his past relevant  
4 work as a film industry grip but could perform a significant number of jobs in the  
5 national economy, including the jobs of Collator Operator, Cleaner,  
6 Housekeeping, Photocopy-Machine Operator, and Cashier. A.R. 12-13.

7 **D. Residual Functional Capacity**

8 Comstock argues that the AC’s RFC was not supported by substantial  
9 evidence. JS at 4.

10 The AC adopted, in part, the functional assessment of a non-examining  
11 state agency physician, Dr. Limos, completed on January 24, 2006. A.R. 10  
12 (citing A.R. 239-246). Limos found that Comstock could lift/carry 20 pounds  
13 occasionally and 10 pounds frequently; could stand, sit, or walk about 6 hours in  
14 an 8-hour workday; and could push/pull without limitation. A.R. 240. The AC  
15 adopted these findings in its RFC. A.R. 10. However, the AC, without  
16 explanation, did not adopt Limos’ other limitations. Limos found that Comstock  
17 could stoop, kneel, crouch, and crawl occasionally (A.R. 241), whereas the AC  
18 found that Comstock could do all those things frequently. A.R. 10. The AC  
19 omitted entirely Limos’ limitation to occasional overhead reaching bilaterally. A.R.  
20 242.

21 “[R]eports of the nonexamining advisor need not be discounted and may  
22 serve as substantial evidence when they are supported by other evidence in the  
23 record and are consistent with it.” *Andrews v. Shalala*, 53 F.3d 1035, 1041 (9th  
24 Cir. 1995). The AC states that Limos’ opinion “is consistent with the clinical  
25 evidence of record, treating and examining source opinions, and the claimant’s  
26 own statements regarding his activities of daily living.” A.R. 10.

27 The AC relied upon the opinion of a consultative physician, Dr. Altman,  
28 that Comstock was capable of performing light work. A.R. 10 (citing A.R. 299-

1 301). However, Dr. Altman concluded that Comstock could push/pull/lift/carry 10  
2 pounds occasionally and frequently; postural activities frequent; and  
3 sit/stand/walk 6 hours in an 8-hour workday. A.R. 299. Light work generally  
4 involves lifting up to 20 pounds at a time. 20 C.F.R. § 404.1567(a)-(b). The AC  
5 points out that, in response to a question about occasional lifting, Dr. Altman's  
6 check-the-box form contains a check mark next to the box for 20 pounds. A.R.  
7 11, 300. It is unusual to give a check-the-box form more weight than a contrary  
8 narrative report.

9       However, any error as to the lift/carry restriction is harmless because the  
10 ALJ's hypothetical to the vocational expert (VE) assumed that Comstock was  
11 limited to lifting and carrying ten pounds occasionally and frequently. A.R. 365.  
12 The VE responded that "even though he can only lift up to ten pounds he could  
13 also perform a light occupation like cashier two, which would be again light,  
14 unskilled." A.R. 366. To accommodate the ten-pound restriction, the VE reduced  
15 the number of jobs to 150,000 nationally and 30,000 in California. A.R. 366-368.  
16 The AC listed the job of cashier II in its findings. A.R. 12.

17       The AC noted that, even assuming a weight limitation, a job is considered  
18 light work when it requires a person to be standing or walking most of the  
19 workday. A.R. 11; 20 C.F.R. 404.1567(b) ("Even though the weight lifted may be  
20 very little, a job is in this category when it requires a good deal of walking or  
21 standing, or when it involves sitting most of the time with some pushing or pulling  
22 of arm or leg controls."). Dr. Altman's opinion that Comstock could stand/walk six  
23 hours is consistent with Limos' opinion that Comstock could stand, sit, or walk  
24 about 6 hours in an 8-hour workday. A.R. 240, 299.

25       With respect to the stand/walk limitation, the AC rejected treating physician  
26  
27  
28

1 (orthopedic surgeon) Dr. deGrange's March 1, 2007,<sup>1</sup> assessment "for less than  
2 sedentary work." A.R. 10, 293. Dr. deGrange found that Comstock could  
3 occasionally and frequently lift/carry 10 pounds, could stand/walk less than 2  
4 hours in an 8-hour workday, and had to alternate positions rather than sit  
5 continuously. A.R. 293.

6 An opinion of a treating physician is given more weight than the opinion of  
7 non-treating physicians. *Orn v. Astrue*, 495 F.3d 625, 631 (9th Cir. 2007). When  
8 a treating physician's opinion is contradicted by another doctor, "the ALJ may not  
9 reject this opinion without providing specific and legitimate reasons supported by  
10 substantial evidence in the record. This can be done by setting out a detailed  
11 and thorough summary of the facts and conflicting clinical evidence, stating his  
12 interpretation thereof, and making findings." *Id.* at 632 (citations and internal  
13 quotation marks omitted).

14 The AC rejected deGrange's March 1, 2007 assessment because it  
15 contradicted deGrange's workers compensation records in 2005. A.R. 10-11. Dr.  
16 deGrange's opinion in February and April 2005 noted "no prolonged sitting" and  
17 "no repetitive motion of the head and neck" in addition to no repetitive bending  
18 and stooping. A.R. 163, 178, 181. There is no apparent contradiction with the  
19 limitations that Comstock could stand/walk two hours, could not sit continuously  
20 and had to alternate positions. A.R. 293. The court notes that the AC rejected,  
21 without explanation, a state agency opinion by Dr. Bobba that Comstock could  
22 stand/walk only "at least 2 hours in an 8-hour workday." A.R. 10, 252.

23 The AC also states that its RFC "is further supported by the claimant's daily  
24 activities. In a July 20, 2005 Function Report, the claimant reported engaging in  
25 the daily activities of preparing meals, shopping, and performing light indoor and  
26 outdoor housework." A.R. 11, 89-96. If a claimant engages in daily activities

---

27 28 <sup>1</sup> The AC mistakenly says the assessment was done on March 10, 2007.  
A.R. 10, 293.

1 involving skills that could be transferred to the workplace, “[t]he ALJ must make  
2 ‘specific findings relating to [the daily] activities’ and their transferability to  
3 conclude that a claimant’s daily activities warrant an adverse credibility  
4 determination.” *Orn*, 495 F.3d at 639. “Only if the level of activity were  
5 inconsistent with the Claimant’s claimed limitations would these activities have  
6 any bearing on Claimant’s credibility.” *Reddick v. Chater*, 157 F.3d 715, 722 (9th  
7 Cir. 1998) (“Several courts, including this one, have recognized that disability  
8 claimants should not be penalized for attempting to lead normal lives in the face  
9 of their limitations.”). The AC did not make such findings. There is no indication  
10 that these daily activities would require Comstock to stand/walk more than two  
11 hours in an eight-hour workday. These activities are consistent with having to  
12 alternate sitting, standing and walking.

13 Because the AC’s rejection of the sit/stand/walk limitations from the treating  
14 physician and state agency opinion are not supported by substantial evidence,  
15 these limitations are credited as a matter of law. See *Widmark v. Barnhart*, 454  
16 F.3d 1063, 1069 (9th Cir. 2006).

17 **E. Remedy**

18 The AC found that Comstock was an individual “closely approaching  
19 advanced age, who has a limited or less education and who has past relevant  
20 work which is of a skilled nature. The issue of transferability of work skills is not  
21 material to this decision.” A.R. 12.

22 If the opinions of the treating physician and state agency physician Dr.  
23 Bobba are credited, Comstock would be capable of sedentary work. Grid Rule  
24 201.10, Table 1 would mandate a finding of disabled.

25 Because there are no issues remaining for the agency to resolve,  
26 Comstock is entitled to an award of benefits. *Orn*, 495 F.3d at 640.

1 IV.  
2

**ORDER**

3 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the matter is remanded for calculation of an  
4 award of benefits.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court serve copies of this  
6 Order and the Judgment herein on all parties or their counsel.

7  
8 DATED: April 21, 2009  
9

*Alicia G. Rosenberg*  
10 ALICIA G. ROSENBERG  
United States Magistrate Judge

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28